

Randall B. Bateman (USB 6482)
C. Todd Kinard (USB 12575)
Sarah W. Matthews (USB 13295)
BATEMAN IP LAW GROUP, P.C.
8 East Broadway, Suite 550
P.O. Box 1319
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110
Tel: (801) 533-0320/Fax: (801) 533-0323
Email: mail@batemanip.com, rbb@batemanip.com, ctk@batemanip.com,
sm@batemanip.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Bateman IP Law Group, P.C.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

BATEMANIP IP LAW GROUP, a Utah
professional corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JOHN DOE, d/b a UNITED STATES
TRADEMARK REGISTRATION
OFFICE; and DOES 2 through 5,

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF BATEMAN IP
LAW GROUP'S MOTION FOR
A PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

Case No. 2:12-cv-00349-BCW

Mag. Judge Brooke C. Wells

BATEMAN IP'S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff

Bateman IP Law Group, P.C. ("Bateman IP") moves this Court for entry of a Preliminary
Injunction against Defendants John Doe, d/b/a United States Trademark Registration

Office, and Does 2 through 5 (collectively “USTRO”). The Order is necessary to prevent irreparable harm to Bateman IP and its clients.

Bateman IP provides law services, including obtaining federal trademark registrations through the United States Patent and Trademark Office. In early 2012, a number of Bateman IP’s clients began receiving letters from Defendants USTRO. These letters were sent by Defendants using the name United States Trademark Registration Office and appeared to be official government correspondence. The letters used the correct mark and serial number of the trademark application/registration, and included correct sections of the United States Code governing trademarks.

The name United States Trademark Office is confusingly similar to the official government entity’s name, the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Not only do these letters appear to be deceptive and confusing, they have caused actual confusion among Bateman IP’s clients who have expressed their belief that they need to pay the fee in order to obtain a trademark registration.

Plaintiff Bateman IP has demonstrated that USTRO’s conduct constitutes a threat of irreparable harm to Bateman IP and that Bateman IP has a very high likelihood of success on the merits on each of its claims for violation of the Lanham Act Unfair Competition, and violation of Utah’s Truth in Advertising Act. Likewise, the balance of hardships heavily favors Bateman IP and the requested relief is in the public interest.

The requested relief is necessary to prevent irreparable harm to Bateman IP and its clients. Therefore, Plaintiff moves this Court to enjoin USTRO from use of its deceptive and misleading name in its business practice.

Dated this 10th day of April, 2012.

BATEMAN IP LAW GROUP

/s/Randall B. Bateman

Randall B. Bateman

C. Todd Kinard

Sarah W. Matthews